

REMARKS

Claims 8-15 are now present in this application.

Claims 1-7 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the abstract, specification, and claim 8 have been amended, and claims 9-15 have been presented. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Entry of Preliminary Amendment

A Preliminary Amendment was filed with the above-identified application on January 14, 2004. This Preliminary Amendment was received and entered by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, since it is available in the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. In this Preliminary Amendment, the dependencies of the claims (including claim 8) were amended. Thus, claim 8 is no longer a multiple-dependent claim. The Examiner has therefore inappropriately failed to treat this claim on the merits. The objection to claim 8 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) should be withdrawn. In addition, claim 8 has now been rewritten and remains in this application. It has not yet received an action on the merits. **If the Examiner is to give another rejection in the next Office Action, it would be inappropriate to make this rejection a final rejection.** Nonetheless, as will be explained below, such a further rejection is not anticipated since the application is now in condition for allowance.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has noted the arrangement for the specification and has asked for headings. Such have been provided and, as such, it is respectfully requested that any objection to the specification now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition, the disclosure stands objected to for the reference to the claims. Because this reference has been removed from the specification, it is respectfully requested that this objection now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner alleges that the two-sided display is not shown. However, Fig. 1A shows the first side of the display, and Fig. 1B shows the second side of the display. Moreover, in Fig. 2, the front side of the display 2 is shown with the indication for the rear side of the display 3. The two-sided display is therefore shown. Moreover, Fig. 1A indicates that the display 1 in the elevator lobby is the same as display 2 within the elevator car. Fig. 2 shows the display 1 in the lobby and the display 2 in the elevator car. It is respectfully submitted that the claimed subject matter is shown. As such, withdrawal of the objection under 37 CFR 1.83(a) is requested.

Objection to the Claims

As noted above, claim 8 has been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being an improper multiple-dependent claim. This is inaccurate and this objection should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The terminology "aforesaid" and numbering of the claimed elements has been removed from the claims. In addition, different floor number displays are set forth. The location of each of the floor displays (in the elevator lobby or the elevator car) should be clear from the claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims should particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b) and 103

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by MANDEL et al., U.S. Patent 4,149,614. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over MANDEL et al. '614, in view of HIKITA, U.S.

Publication 2003/0164267 A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7/3, 7/4, and 7/5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over MANDEL et al. '614 and HIKITA, and further in view of MANDEL et al., U.S. Patent 4,032,882. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that the Examiner has indicated claim 7 as being a multiple-dependent claim. However, as explained above, the Preliminary Amendment filed on January 14, 2004 removed the multiple dependencies, including that of claim 7. Claim 7 as originally filed only depended on claim 3.

Turning to the MANDEL '614 patent, an elevator system is disclosed. The Examiner appears to utilize the disclosure of the embodiments shown in Figs. 9 and 10. There is a broad recitation of MANDEL '614 teaching a display in Figs. 1-10, but it is the embodiments of Figs. 9 and 10 which are discussed. In these embodiments, elevator panels for entering calls for elevator systems are provided. The panels include both push buttons (for entering car calls) and displays (for visualization of active calls). The present invention, on the other hand, describes display systems for a destination car call system where display information is optimized for passengers both inside and outside the elevator car. Displays according to the present invention can be installed without any push buttons or other input systems. Also, in the

invention, each elevator has its own display besides the elevator door in the hall. In the MANDEL '614 patent, column 10, lines 39-43 state a destination panel which may be associated with any one of the plurality of cars. The present invention will provide an amount of information which will be displayed for passengers both inside and outside of the car, which is optimized and minimized. Therefore, the invention will facilitate passenger travel to the destination floor.

The secondary reference to HIKITA would not be combined by a skilled artisan with the MANDEL teachings. The HIKITA patent does not state display systems which display the same information in the elevator car and in the hall for passengers who are also entering the elevator car. The third document to MANDEL '882 shows a display system which has a wide viewing angle but is not capable of showing different information for passengers inside/outside of the elevator car. This MANDEL '882 patent does not overcome the noted deficiencies.

The floor number displays of the present invention are neither suggested nor rendered obvious by the prior art utilized by the Examiner. As such, it is respectfully requested that the 35 USC 102(b) and 103 rejections now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

KM/asc
1381-0308P

Enclosure: Abstract of the Disclosure